



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

leveled against French colonial methods have lost much of their justification. The French have ceased to be *a priori* assimilationists; that artificial policy cost them too dearly in Algeria. They are now more carefully adapting their institutions to local needs, and the highest form of intelligence has been employed in solving specific local problems. The vast literature on colonial affairs which the French have developed and which has at times been pointed to as evidence of their inaptitude in practical affairs, is bearing fruit in the intelligence brought to bear on colonial administration. French colonial officials are indeed fortunate to be able to carry with them in their pockets a manual, so illuminating, so careful and safe in detail, as this treatise of Professor Girault; and no one who cares to inform himself about what is actually being done in the great world of colonial enterprise can afford to neglect this book.

P. S. REINSCH.

*Japanese Rule in Formosa.* By YOSABURO TAKEKOSHI. Translated by George Braithwaite. (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. Pp. xv, 342.)

This is an account of the difficulties encountered by the Japanese in Formosa, the means adopted to overcome them and the practical results. It is profusely illustrated and a large map is appended. The author is a member of the Japanese diet, and the book is the outcome of an extensive tour of observation. The authenticity of his statements is vouched for in a preface contributed by Baron Shimpei Goto, chief of civil administration in Formosa. The book goes into minute detail in regard to the resources of the country, and the measures by which the administration is promoting industrial development and social progress. The author avows a patriotic purpose. He desires to show that the Japanese, quite as well as western nations, are capable of sustaining colonial responsibilities. Baron Goto, in his preface, attributes the success gained to "The Great Guardian Spirit who through unbroken ages has continually guided His Majesty the Emperor and each of His Imperial Ancestors." If so, the Great Guardian Spirit must be quite free of what may be called political denominationalism—that is to say, the notion that in making choice of means it is incumbent to adhere to principles of government in vogue in the home country. Instead of doing as we have done in our colonies—impose our own institutions and then try to make over the character of the people so that they can work such institutions—the Japanese have suited colonial institutions to the

character of the people. If one may judge institutions of government by their fruits, the showing made in this book presents a strong case to the effect that the Japanese have chosen the better way.

HENRY JONES FORD.

*Neutral Rights and Obligations in the Anglo-Boer War.* By ROBERT GRANVILLE CAMPBELL. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1908. Pp. 149).

As stated in the preface, this monograph is "the outgrowth of work done in the Political Science Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University and is a portion of a larger study dealing with the causes of the Anglo-Boer war and the questions of international law arising during that conflict."

Mr. Campbell has had several predecessors in this field. The best known of these is Frantz Despagne whose *La guerre sud-africaine au point de vue du droit international* was published in the *Revue générale de droit international public* for 1900 and republished in 1902. This monograph of 400 pages was based largely on reports in pro-Boer French newspapers and dealt mainly with the relations between the belligerents. The same may in general be said of an interesting essay by A. Desjardins which appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for March, 1900.

Of quite a different character was the small volume of 127 pages entitled *International Law in South Africa*, by T. Baty, which appeared in 1900. Although very limited in its choice of topics and (as the reviewer thinks) mistaken in some of its premises and conclusions, Mr. Baty's work contains some very incisive reasoning and is a real contribution to our science.

Of these three publicists, Mr. Baty is the only one whose views are cited and discussed by our author, although hardly to the extent that the importance of the work seems to deserve. The first two chapters of Mr. Campbell's monograph deal with the neutrality of the United States and European powers. Attention is called to the fact that the United States was the only power which acted on the recommendation of the Hague conference of 1899 and tendered its good offices during the war to secure, if possible, the cessation of hostilities; but the author fails to note that this appears to be the first example in our history of such an offer under similar circumstances, i. e., in a case in which American interests were not directly involved.

The only serious charge against the United States for violation of